## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 16, 22, 25-28 and 30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 16, 22, 26-28, and 30 are amended. No claims are cancelled. Claims 35-38 are added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art.

## INVENTION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

Applicants note the file records indicate an Information Disclosure Statement filed on 2/26/08 has not been initialed by the Examiner and placed in the Office's official file. Applicants respectfully request a signed copy be included in the next communication from the Office.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS--35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 22, 26-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims allegedly fail to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Office Action states that the Claims are drawn to a form of energy because "medium" may include signals. In response, Applicants have amended each of Claims 22, 26-28 and 30 to "computer readable storage medium." The amended claims do not reference signals and thus Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

## CLAIMS REJECTION--35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTION

Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 16, 22, 25-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states the claim limitation "storing the result data obtained from the source in a format that reflects said organization and data type information" in Claims 1, 16, and

22 was not described in the specification. Furthermore, Claims 4-5, 9, 25-28, and 30 were

rejected for the same reason as these claims are dependents of Claims 1, 16, and 22.

However, the Written Specification does describe this limitation. The Written

Specification states "… DBMS extracts the query result from the AnyDataSet-formatted

container according to the query duration types registered during the compilation phase, in effect

parsing each blob according to the field mapping indicated by the query duration types, and

copies the extracted field-mapped components of each blob into the output buffers generated at

block 211 of the compilation phase." (*Written Specification*, pp. 12-13, para. [0017]).

The Office Action in the "Response to Arguments" stated that the cited section of the

Written Specification did not describe the limitation. However, "The subject matter of the claim

need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*) in order for the

disclosure to satisfy the description requirement." (*MPEP*, 2163.02). For example, the Written

Specification states the "DBMS extracts the query result from the AnyDataSet-formatted

container according to the query duration types registered during the compilation phase." This

relates to the "result data obtained from the source" because the query result is the data returned

from executing the table function. (*Written Specification*, para. [0017]). This query result data

is stored in the AnyDataSet-formatted container that is an opaque container in the form of an

array of blobs. (*Written Specification*, para. [0017]). The DBMS then extracts the data from the

AnyDataSet-formatted container to store the data in output buffers according to the query

duration types ("QDT"). To put some terms of the cited section of paragraph [0017] in better

context, paragraph [0016] is also considered. When the QDT is first registered during

compilation phase, output buffers reflecting the formats of the QDT are generated. (*Written

Specification*, para. [0016], block 211). When the DBMS "copies the extracted field-mapped

components of each blob [AnyDataSet-formatted container] into the output buffers," the query

result data is stored 'in a format that that reflects the original organization and data type

information.' Thus, even though the subject matter of Claims 1, 16, and 22 was not described *in

haec verba*, the disclosure does satisfy the description requirement as stated in *MPEP*, 2163.02.

As such the limitation is described in the Written Specification and the rejection is traversed and

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 16, 22, 25-28

and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

CONCLUSION

      For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.  Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

      The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

      Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.


                                    Respectfully submitted,

                                    Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated:  _10/29/08_                    _/RobertSChee#58554/_           
                                      Robert S. Chee
                                      Reg. No. 58,544

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California   95110-1083
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1213
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076